

2018-11

# Public perceptions of management priorities for the English Channel region

Carpenter, A

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/12592>

---

10.1016/j.marpol.2018.07.001

Marine Policy

Elsevier

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

**Abstract:** The English Channel region is an area of high conservational importance, as well being a contributor to economic prosperity, social well-being and quality of life of the people living around it. There is a need to incorporate societal elements into marine and coastal governance, to improve management of the Channel ecosystem. Public Perception Research (PPR) is a relatively unexplored dimension of marine science, with limited research at the scale of the Channel region. Using an online survey, this study examined the public's use of, and funding priorities for, the Channel's marine and coastal environment. It revealed that there are variations in how the English and French coastlines are used. Environmental issues were generally viewed as being more important than economic ones. Country-level differences were observed for public uses of, and priorities for the Channel region. Cleaner water and beaches, and improved coastal flood defences, were more highly prioritised by English respondents, while offshore renewable energy and sustainability of businesses were more highly prioritised by French respondents. The paper contributes to the debate on the value of PPR by addressing evidence gaps in the English Channel region, and to PPR literature more broadly. It provides baseline data to inform future engagement strategies for the marine and coastal governance of the Channel region specifically. It also identifies how this type of research has implications for the wider marine and coastal environment, including contributing to Sustainable Development Goal 14 on conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas, and marine resources.

**Research highlights:**

- The paper presents survey findings on public use of and priorities for the Channel.
- There are country-level differences in public use and priorities for the Channel.
- Environmental issues are generally viewed as more important than economic ones.
- English and French coasts present different opportunities for leisure and recreation.
- PPR is important for governance of global marine and coastal environments.

**Keywords:** English Channel; Le Manche; Public Perception Research; marine governance; marine environment; public engagement

<sup>1</sup>School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, UK; <sup>2</sup>Centre for Marine and Coastal Policy Research, Plymouth University, UK; <sup>3</sup>Plymouth Marine Laboratory, UK; <sup>4</sup>European Centre for Environment and Human Health, University of Exeter, Truro, UK, <sup>5</sup>University of Gävle, Sweden, <sup>6</sup>UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre, UK

## 35 1. Introduction

36 Marine and coastal environments are some of the most productive and valued ecosystems in the  
 37 world [1, 2]. However, they are also some of the most heavily degraded environments as a result of  
 38 substantial and increasing human pressures, threats and challenges [3-5]. This is reflected in the  
 39 English Channel (known as La Manche in France; hereafter the Channel), an area of high conservation  
 40 importance and one which contributes to economic prosperity, social well-being and quality of the life  
 41 [6]. The geographical area of the Channel is defined as having, as its western limit a line from  
 42 48°38'23"N 4°34'13"W to 50°04'N 5°43'W (i.e. Ushant to the Scilly Isles) and as its eastern limit (across  
 43 the Dover Strait) a line joining the Walde lighthouse in France, at 51°00'N 1°55'E, and Leathercoat  
 44 Point in England, at 51°10'N 1°55'E [7]. However, the boundaries of the region and its coastal zone can  
 45 vary depending on the issues being considered, with different boundaries applied by OSPAR, the EU,  
 46 and other bodies [6].

47 This paper is based on the results of an online survey conducted under the aegis of the Promoting  
 48 Effective Governance of the Channel Ecosystem (PEGASEAS) Project and was intended to provide  
 49 recommendations and identify future challenges for the Interreg V Programme for 2014-2020  
 50 (successor to Interreg IV)<sup>1</sup>. All areas included within the Interreg V programme area for the Channel  
 51 were included in the survey. This includes all the South Coast of England, from Kent to Cornwall, all of  
 52 the North Coast of France, from Calais to Brest, and incorporates the marine, coastal and terrestrial  
 53 space within the region (see Figure 1). Responses to the survey came from all of the Interreg V eligible  
 54 areas, and a breakdown of the residence of those respondents (English by County, French by  
 55 Département is provided in the Supplementary Material to this paper (Supp.Mat. Figs. 1 and 2).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Interreg Europe programme<sup>1</sup> helps regional and local governments across Europe to develop and deliver policy measures that have an integrated and sustainable impact on both people and places. For further information in the Interreg Programme see <https://www.interregeurope.eu/about-us/what-is-interreg-europe/>



**Figure 1: Map of the Channel, including Interreg V eligible areas**

Map courtesy of the Challenger Society, UK, [www.challenger-society.org.uk](http://www.challenger-society.org.uk) [8]

The Channel is a vibrant area, with a growing population living along the coasts of what is one of the busiest maritime regions in the world [6]. It faces a range of economic, social and environmental challenges, including unemployment, social deprivation, vulnerability to the impacts of climate change (e.g. marine-source flooding events and coastal erosion), and ecological deterioration relating to multiple human pressures [9]. Managing both natural environmental risks and the impacts of human activities requires implementation of cross-sectoral, multi-disciplinary, and integrated approaches. Effective management also requires engagement with, and by, the public, and should be based on clear, powerful, and communicable advice, in order to support improved governance of the Channel region [9].

In this paper, marine governance is defined in the broadest sense as the sum of all the processes, organisations, institutions and instruments with an influence over how the marine ecosystem of the Channel is used and managed [6, 9]. There is growing recognition and awareness of the need for a

greater understanding of how to incorporate the societal element of marine issues into the governance of marine and coastal environments [10, 11]. This has led to a greater emphasis on Public Perception Research (PPR) [10] and its application to marine governance, conservation and policy [12-16]. PPR explores the public's knowledge, interest, social values, attitudes and behaviours [10]. It is predominantly an area of research within social sciences, which incorporates insights from a range of disciplines including psychology, sociology, human geography and the natural sciences [10].

The paper is structured in the following way. Section 2 presents an overview of PPR in general and then more specifically in relation to the marine and coastal environment (including evidence gaps for the Channel). Section 3 addresses evidence gaps for the Channel region by presenting the results of the large-scale survey. The survey on which this paper is based is, to the authors' knowledge, the first to identify public use, and perceptions, of a cross-border geographic region. Section 4 analyses the findings of the online survey, identifying how respondents use the Channel coasts in England and France. It compares funding priorities between the two countries on the basis of Interreg V funding categories, before focusing on priorities for the marine and coastal environment more specifically. Implications and limitations of the research are identified in Section 5, together with areas where data collected from the public survey can be used for further research. Finally, in Section 6, the paper draws conclusions from the findings of the survey and examines how those findings can contribute both to the PPR literature and support the future governance of the Channel and the wider marine and coastal environment. This is important as understanding the different uses of the coasts can contribute to effective governance in the wider context of the oceans [17], for example in achieving Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 14 on conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas, and marine resources [18].

## **2. Overview of Public Perception Research (PPR)**

In recent years, a growing number of studies have focused on public perceptions of the marine and coastal environment and marine governance. They have explored public perceptions of marine health [15], marine biodiversity [16], attitudes to marine and coastal environments [19-21], marine issues including climate change and ocean acidification [22-24], conservation measures including Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) [25], and blue growth [26]. Such research is important as a strength of PPR for marine governance is the creation of better relationships between stakeholders, together with increased public engagement in decision making [10].

These studies pave the way towards a better understanding of social values, attitudes and uses of the marine and coastal environment. To date, they have helped to provide some initial insight into public

perceptions and form a basis for further investigations [9]. Current and future PPR research can have several benefits, including:

1. It can help to gain public support for current and future research projects and studies [19]. An understanding of public views on future priorities for governance can help researchers and national and local authorities to make informed decisions on future funding priorities and management approaches [10].
2. It can help to inform and support ocean governance, policy and decision-making. The public can be the key to the success or failure of marine policy and conservation measures [8, 19]. Public perceptions and opinions of marine and coastal environments can play a role in advising conservation planning and the designation of Marine Protected Areas [27], in the development and reform of marine spatial planning [28] and management of marine resources [29, 30] and in the deployment of marine renewable energy [19];
3. An increased understanding of society can help to shape engagement approaches for specific audiences [10]. Knowledge of how societies engage with the sea and pro-environmental behaviour can assist in setting and monitoring environmental targets (e.g. reduction of plastic bag use [31], and targeted educational and awareness strategies (e.g. to change behaviour) [32]. Evidence suggests that public participation in 'citizen science' activities, such as beach cleaning or monitoring of marine and coastal habitats, can have a positive effect on marine conservation and management [33]. Increasing public engagement can also help to bring about a sense of 'marine citizenship' on an individual and/or collective basis, for example, where individuals exhibit an awareness of and concern for the marine environment and a motivation to change their behaviour to lessen impacts on seas and oceans [15, 34]; and

There is a gap in understanding of public perceptions at the Channel scale. Research has previously taken a country-specific approach and has explored (i) the uses of the marine environment [20, 34], (ii) perceptions of the public in the UK and France nationally [19-20, 35-36], and (iii) examined the public awareness, concerns and priorities relating to the marine environment across various European countries [19, 22]. There are two specific reasons why PPR is necessary at the scale of the Channel. Firstly, there is a lack of evidence on how the public use the Channel. Understanding public use has the potential to contribute to the management and planning of marine resources for both the Channel and the wider marine environment including SDG 14 on conservation and sustainable use of the ocean, seas and marine resources [17-18, 37]. For example, this data can be used as a social baseline for the development and monitoring of the impact of marine spatial plans. Secondly, there is increasing need to understand public views on future priorities for the governance of the Channel, to enable

national and local authorities to make informed decisions on management, planning and conservation strategies for the region, and to identify future funding priorities.

### 3. Methods

Recognising the evidence gaps, individuals from England and France were surveyed to gain a better understanding of how the public use the Channel coasts of Southern England and Northern France, and their perceptions of the region. Information was also collected on individual respondent priorities for investment in the Channel region, if public funding were available to improve it.

#### 3.1. Survey design

The survey was comprised of four sections, based around the following themes: (i) socio-demographic information, (ii) public use of the Channel area (English Channel/La Manche); (iii) public funding priorities for the Channel; (iv) and pro-environmental behaviours. Sections (ii) and (iii) are considered in more detail in this paper. The basic survey questions for (ii) to (iv) is outlined in Table 1 while full details of the options for those questions are provided in the Supplementary Material to this paper (Supp. Mat. Table 1). All of the questions posed were ‘closed’, i.e. respondents did not have the option of providing additional information.

<p><b><i>i. Background/socio-demographic information</i></b></p> <p>Q1. What region do you live in?</p> <p>Q2. Which of the following best describes the area where you live?</p>
<p><b><i>ii. Public use of the Channel area (English Channel /La Manche)</i></b></p> <p>Q3: How often do you visit the Channel coast?</p> <p>Q4: Why do you visit the Channel coast?</p> <p>Q5: What do you do when you visit the Channel coast?</p>
<p><b><i>iii. Public funding priorities for the Channel</i></b></p> <p>Q6 If there was public funding available to improve the Channel area, how would you spend it?</p> <p>Q7: This question specifically focuses on the Channel area’s marine and coastal environment. If there was public funding available, how would you spend it?</p>
<p><b><i>iv. Participation in pro-environmental behaviours</i></b></p> <p>Q8: Based on your knowledge and responses to this survey, have you or would you be willing to change your behaviour to protect the environment?</p>

**Table 1: Specific Survey Questions**

NOTE: Section iv and Q8 in Table 1 are not examined in this paper.

### **3.1.1. Background/socio-demographic information**

The first section asked respondents for their socio-demographic information, including the region (Q1; i.e. the Interreg V area, set out in Figure 1) and the type of area (Q2; urban, suburban, village/rural or other) they lived in, together with their employment status (for example in full time employment, self-employed, retired). This data was combined with socio-demographic held by GMI, which detailed age, gender, and education level (see Supp. Mat. Table 2).

### **3.1.2. Public use of the Channel area**

The second section of the survey focused on the use of the Channel area. Respondents were asked (Q3) how frequently respondents visited the Channel coast (France, England or both sides of the Channel), (Q4) why they visited the Channel coast (holiday, work, recreation, live there, travel or other) and (Q5) the types of activities they undertook when they visited the Channel coast (see Table 1). If a respondent visited both the English and French coasts, they were asked to provide information for each side of the Channel. Furthermore, if respondents stated that they had never visited the Channel coast or only worked there they were automatically directed to the questions on public funding priorities.

### **3.1.3. Public funding priorities for the Channel**

The third section of the survey focused on respondents' funding priorities for the Channel region. All respondents were asked this question, regardless of their use of and visitation to the Channel region. Firstly, at Q6, they were asked to rank the importance of thirteen priorities using a five point Likert scale (1 = 'not important at all', 5 = 'very important'). The development of the priorities was based on documentation on the upcoming Interreg V for the France (Channel) England cross-border cooperation programme for 2014-2020 (see Table 2). Interreg sought information under the broad themes of business and local economy, renewable energy, tourism and natural and cultural heritage, environment, and regeneration and deprivation. The research was intended to help direct the Interreg funding agenda for the period 2014-2020. Secondly, at Q7, respondents were presented with seventeen priorities relating specifically to the marine and coastal environment of the Channel. They were asked to select both their five most favoured and five least favoured priorities for public funding, if public money was available. The purpose for doing so is discussed in Section 2, where an understanding of public priorities is identified as being necessary can help to gain public support for current and future research projects and studies [19]. Options for the both questions were randomised.



Themes	Public Priority
Business and local economy	To support and develop future sustainability in businesses
	To help businesses better respond to economic pressures and/or create new jobs
	To strengthen and build networks between businesses and other stakeholder groups
Renewable energy	To further research into renewable energy technology and its potential impacts (on land and sea)
	To increase the use and awareness of renewable energy by businesses and the public
Tourism, and natural and cultural heritage	To promote tourism and interest in the history, culture and geology and other attractions on the Channel coast
	To support local businesses providing services or goods to visitors and tourists of the Channel Coast
Environment	To raise public awareness of the Channel environment (e.g. through campaigns and social media)
	To reduce pollution and improve the management of environmental risks
	To improve the management of natural resources and conservation of the Channel Environment
	To increase awareness of the benefits that the Channel environment provides to humans (e.g. fish, leisure and recreation, health)
	To support adaptation to climate change
Regeneration and deprivation	To support physical, economic and social regeneration in deprived urban and rural communities

**Table 2: Public Priorities for the Interreg V-A (France (Channel) – England) cross-border cooperation programme 2014-2020**

### 3.2. Survey mode, piloting and administration

Ethical approval for the study was granted by Plymouth University Faculty of Science and Environment Research Ethics Committee. An online survey was selected as the survey mode and was administered by a commercial market research company, Global Marketing Insite (GMI; now GMI Lightspeed), which maintains a global panel of respondents. The online survey was used to access a broad cross-section of respondents, from a large and geographically distributed population [38]. Previous work has shown that online surveys can be administered in a time-efficient manner [39], are robust in delivering questionnaires [39], are convenient for respondents [40], are cost effective [41] and can achieve improved or comparable response rate to other survey modes (e.g. mail survey) [42]. The results of such surveys are also consistent with results from traditional pencil and papers surveys [43].

There are, however, limitations with the use of online surveys, including self-selection bias [44] and sample representativeness [41, 44]. For example, there may be a small inherent bias from sampling respondents registered on a database with a market research company [20, 44]. The target sample size was 2000 (c.a. 1000 responses from each country) and respondents were recruited based on two criteria: that they were over 16 years of age, and that they lived within one of the Interreg V eligible areas (see Figure 1).

The survey was pre-tested ahead of administration, using 100 respondents in each country, to assess the clarity of the language and to identify any issues with understanding of the questions (i.e. qualitative pre-testing). Based on this, no alterations were made to the survey; therefore, these initial responses were included in the final results. The survey closed after approximately two weeks, once 2,000 responses had been received. Respondents received a nominal fee of £1.25 to complete the survey, which helped to reduce the likelihood of bias from auto self-selection [20].

### **3.3. Respondent profile**

In addition to the main groups of questions set out in Table 1, specific socio-demographic data was obtained from GMI including: respondent age, gender and employment status (see Supp. Mat. Table 2). GMI was also able to provide some further details on respondents from existing data sets, including highest level of education, income data, and socio-economic status. These factors were not considered in the analysis as, for example, in the case of socio-economic status, data was only available for 45% of respondents, and was provided under differing systems. Social grade data<sup>2</sup> (i.e. A, B, C1, C2, D and E) was provided for English respondents, whereas socio-professional group data (e.g. Farmer, Craftsman/shopkeeper/business owner, Executives and professionals) was given for French respondents. Direct comparison between these categories was not possible. Data on income was not available for 55% of respondents and was therefore also excluded from the analysis of the survey data.

### **3.4. Statistical analysis**

Many of the items were measured on nominal or ordinal scales, which required the use of non-parametric tests. A range of tests were used to examine whether there were significant differences between (i) French and English respondents and (ii) the two coasts (English coast and French Coast) for the majority of the questions [45]. For Q4 on why each respondent visited the Channel coast, and

---

<sup>2</sup> In the UK approximated Social Grades fall under six categories, A, B, C1, C2, D and E and provide socio-economic classifications of every Household Reference Person between the ages of 16 and 64 (see <http://www.ukgeographics.co.uk/blog/social-grade-a-b-c1-c2-d-e>). In France a range of socio-professional categories (CSPs) are used to categorise individuals by their professional situation (see <https://www.insee.fr/en/metadonnees/definition/c1758>), Data on UK respondent social grades and French respondent CSPs was provided by GMI.

for Q5 on what activities the respondent participated in, a McNemar test was used because the observations are related (since the same individual can visit both coasts), and the variables are nominal (1 or 0). For Q6 on the respondent's preference for spending public money, responses were given on a 5-point Likert scale resulting in independent samples comparing English and French responses; a t-test was therefore used to test for differences between English and French respondents (based on mean averages). For Q7 on public spending preferences relating to the marine and coastal environment specifically, a Chi-squared test was used as both variables 'country' and 'most preferred priority' are nominal and independent. All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 22.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Respondent profile

The general profile of survey respondents is displayed in Table 3.


Characteristics	Sample population (EN) (n=999)	Sample population (FR) (n=1001)
<b>Gender (%)</b>		
Male	45	48
Female	55	52
<b>Age Profile</b>		
Age Range	16 – 82	16 – 79
Mean Age	44	46
Median Age	43	47
<b>Employment status (%)</b>		
Full time (30+ hours/week)	40.5	46.0
Part time (less than 30 hours/week)	13.0	8.0
Self- employed (30+ hours/week)	7.0	2.5
Self-employed (less than 30 hours/week)	2.5	1.0
In full time education	5.5	7.0
Retired	16.0	20.5
Not working for any other reason	14.5	12.0

**Table 3: Characteristics of respondents in the sample (n=2000).**

*NOTE: Additional information on the place of residence of English and French respondents appears in the Supplementary Material as Figures 1 and 2.*

## 4.2. Public use of the Channel Coast


As identified in Table 1, three specific questions were posed on how the public use the Channel, including the frequency of visits to the Channel coast (Q3), why they visit the coast (Q4) and what they do when they visit the coast (Q5). From Q3, 90% of respondents had visited the Channel coast (either in England, France or both) at some point in time (n=1802). In total 73% of all survey respondents (n=1489) had visited the English Channel Coast and 68% of all respondents (n=1399) had visited the French Channel coast. 50% of English respondents (n=499) and 47% of French respondents (n=469) visited the Channel coast at least once or twice a year. 10% of all respondents (n=198) stated that they never visit the Channel region. There was no statistically significant difference between English and French respondents in terms of how often they visit the Channel region (Figure 2).



**Figure 2: Frequency of visits to the (English and French) Channel Coast (n= 2000).**

The main reasons for visiting the Channel coast (see Figure 3) were primarily for recreation (80% of all respondents, n=1596), and holidays (i.e. staying in the area and taking part in activities there; 50%, n=989). The reasons for visiting the English coast and French coast were compared between English and French respondents, using a McNemar Test. There were significant differences between English and French respondents for the categories of holidays and travel ( $p < 0.05$ ). French respondents were more likely to go on holiday (i.e. stay in the area for a period of time; more than one day) to the

Channel coast than English respondents. English respondents were more likely to travel (i.e. stay in the area for a short period of time; one day or less), or travel from one side of the Channel to the other) on the Channel coast than French respondents.




\*  $p < 0.05$  (McNemar Test)

**Figure 3. Reasons for visiting the Channel Coast (n=1802)**

Q5 asked respondents what they did when they visited the Channel coast (in one or both countries), and could select a maximum of 5 activities that they participated in. Figure 4 compares responses by country for each of the 15 activities. Enjoying the scenery is the most popular activity for nearly half of all respondents, i.e. 49% of those visiting the English coast at any time and 48% of those visiting French coast. Surface water-sports such as water-skiing, kayaking and rowing, were selected by less than 4% of respondents visiting either the English or French coast.

While the McNemar test identified that there were no significant differences between the way English and French respondents used the Channel coast, across the 15 categories of activities, there were significant differences between activities being undertaken on the two coastlines. These differences were identified for seven of the activities (see Figure 4): visiting historic landmarks ( $p < 0.01$ ), visiting cultural attractions ( $p < 0.01$ ), artistic and creative activities ( $p < 0.01$ ) and education ( $p < 0.01$ ) were all carried out more by respondents visiting the English Coast, than those visiting the French coast. Activities such as wildlife watching ( $p < 0.01$ ), fishing ( $p < 0.01$ ), and in-water sports ( $p < 0.01$ ) were significantly more popular at the French coast, compared to the English coast.




\*\*p<0.01 (McNemar Test)

**Figure 4. Activities undertaken when visiting the (English or French) Channel Coast (n=1802)**

### 4.3. Public funding priorities for the Channel Coast - Interreg IV classifications

Q6 (see Table 1) considered public funding priorities for the Channel coast on the basis of five main public funding priorities provided by Interreg IV for the France (Channel) England cross-border cooperation programme for 2014-2020 (see Table 3)

The three most highly ranked of the public priorities among all respondents, identified in Table 2, combining 'important' and 'very important' responses (Likert scale options 4 and 5), were: improving natural resource management and conservation (71%), reducing pollution and environmental risk (70%); and promoting tourism (64%). Three priorities received the largest amount of 'not important' or 'of little importance' responses: strengthening and building networks (21%), raising public awareness through campaigns (14%) and supporting adaptation to climate change (13%). Figure 5 compares the funding priorities for English and French respondents. French respondents ranked all priorities higher than English respondents. There are significant differences between English and French respondents for the majority of funding priorities, with the exception of supporting regeneration in urban and rural areas, and promoting tourism and culture.




\*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05 (T-test). Note: The order in which these ranking appear is on the basis of priorities for French respondents. For the complete text of the funding priorities see Table 2.

**Figure 5: Comparison of Interreg funding priorities between English and French respondents (n=2000).**

#### 4.4 Public Funding Priorities for the Channel - marine and coastal environment specific

For Q7 (see Table 1) respondents were asked to select both their five most favoured and five least favoured marine and coastal priorities for public funding, as illustrated in Figure 6. There were significant differences between French and English respondents for 7 priorities: ensuring clean water and beaches ( $p<0.01$ ), improving coastal flood defences ( $p<0.01$ ), encouraging offshore marine renewable energy ( $p<0.01$ ), working with businesses ( $p<0.01$ ), encouraging eco-friendly developments ( $p<0.01$ ), promoting research ( $p<0.01$ ) and creating stronger cultural links ( $p<0.01$ ). English respondents placed more of a priority on ensuring clean water and beaches and improving coastal flood defences, in comparison to French respondents. French respondents placed greater priority on the following: (i) encouraging offshore marine renewable energy, (ii) working with businesses, (iii) encouraging eco-friendly developments, (iv) promoting research, and (v) creating stronger cultural links, than English respondents.



338

339 \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$  (Asymptotic significance, two sided). (Chi-squared test, performed on most favoured priorities). *Note: The order in which these ranking*  
 340 *appear is on the basis of the most favoured priorities for English respondents (not the side of the Channel).*

341 **Figure 6: Most favoured and least favoured priorities for improving the marine and coastal environment of the Channel**



## **5. Discussion**

This paper analysed the key findings of a public survey of respondents living in the Channel region (English Channel/ La Manche). The discussion is structured around two main sections of the survey: (i) public use of the Channel coast (5.1) and (ii) public priorities for the Channel coast (5.2). This is followed by a discussion of country-level differences (5.3) and the implications of the study and opportunities for future research (5.4).

### **5.1 Public use of the Channel Coast**

The first finding of the survey relates to the way respondents use the Channel environment. The majority of respondents (approx. 50%) visited the Channel Coast once or twice a year. This coincides with previous research for the UK coast, which examined how the UK public interacted with the marine environment, and coastal and inter-tidal spaces [20] and found that 58% of respondents to an online survey on UK public perceptions of the marine environment visited the UK coast more than once a year [20].

The data analysis from the survey of English and French respondents living in the Channel region found that the Channel was mainly used for recreation and holidays and enjoying the scenery and relaxing and unwinding were the most frequently undertaken activities by respondents. This corresponds with a study which found that English and French respondents considered scenery to be one of the most important services of the ocean [19]. From the online survey, only 4% of all respondents reported that they use the Channel for activities such as surface water-sports (e.g. water-skiing, kayaking and rowing), in-water water sports (e.g. scuba diving, snorkelling, swimming) or for recreational fishing (e.g. from the shore or boat). This follows a similar trend to previous research which showed that fewer respondents undertake activities which take them below the low tide mark in the UK (e.g. swimming and water sports); participation in such activities was estimated to be 7% in one study [35] and 18% in another study [10]. Both are somewhat higher than the 4% identified in the current study.

### **5.2 Public priorities for the Channel Coast**

From the survey findings, it appears that the environment is the highest priority for the public. The respondents were found to prioritise the environment over other factors such as improving businesses and the local economy. This may be as a result of the majority of respondents holidaying on the Channel coast or using it for recreation, rather than living or working there, with business improvements therefore being less directly relevant to them. This is in contrast with a European public opinion survey [46], where the environment and climate change were viewed as a much lower priority by the public in both England and France [46]. Similarly, a survey of European attitudes towards the

marine and coastal environments found that concerns over the oceans were low, although it was recognised as an important provider of ecosystem services [19]. However, that 10 country study of levels of concern and awareness of marine impacts found that age and generation (under 27, 27-45, 46-64 years of age) can influence perceptions on marine issues more than the proximity to the coast [19]. This is an aspect of the current study that would merit further analysis and is discussed further in Section 5.4.

The respondents perceived improving natural resource management and conservation and reducing pollution and environmental risk to be the most important priorities for the Channel coast. Concern over pollution and its impacts has been previously identified in England and France [19-20, 23-24]. There may be a number of reasons for this finding. Firstly, the issue of pollution may be more easily understood by the public in comparison to other issues. This may be due to media coverage and the more direct and clear relationship between pollution and risks to human health [20]. Secondly, the public may associate the environment (e.g. seas and oceans) with pollution [47-48].

Ensuring clean water and beaches and protecting plants and animals in the sea and on the coasts were perceived to be the most important marine and coastal priorities. This supports the responses to Q6 where reducing pollution and improving management of environmental risks, and improving the management of natural resources of the Channel coast received the highest levels of support among the priorities identified for the Interreg V-A France (Channel) England cross-border cooperation programme for 2014-2020. The importance of cleanliness of water and beaches has been identified previously [24]. Water pollution, sewage and litter are perceived to be significant issues affecting the health of marine environments [19-20, 24]. For example, previous research indicates that the UK public are pessimistic about the health of the seas [20, 49-50] and perceive it to be in fair or poor health [25].

The protection of marine and coastal plants and animals were also highly prioritised by respondents. This finding contrasts with previous PPR research. Prior studies have found that wildlife conservation, habitat degradation and loss and the loss of biodiversity are not considered to be the most important marine environmental problems [20, 23]. They are often behind that of issues such as pollution and coastal erosion. In addition to this, respondents did not deem 'identifying priorities for coastal adaptation to climate change' as a high priority. This may imply that climate change is not perceived to be one of the biggest threats to the Channel's environment. This is in keeping with previous surveys in the UK and France administered during a similar time period [20, 23-24].

### 5.3. Country level differences

The use of the Channel coast and public priorities for funding were compared between the two countries. The study revealed that there were country-level differences with respect to the reasons for using the Channel. French respondents are more likely to holiday (i.e. stay for more than one day) on the Channel coast than English respondents. Conversely, English respondents used the Channel coastal area more for travelling (i.e. staying for one day or less, travelling from one side of the Channel to the other), than French respondents. However, there were no country-level differences in the types of activity undertaken by respondents. English and French respondents participate in similar activities when visiting the Channel coast, predominantly enjoying the scenery, and relaxing and unwinding. However, there were significant differences in the activities undertaken on the two coastlines. The English side of the Channel is more frequently used for visiting historic landmarks and cultural attractions, as well as for education, research and artistic and creative activities. In contrast, wildlife watching, fishing and in-water sports are undertaken more often on the French coast.

There were also differences in the funding priorities of English and French respondents. Overall, French respondents rated all priorities higher than English respondents, with the exception of: (i) promoting tourism and interest in the history, culture and geology and other attractions on the Channel coast; and (ii) to support physical, economic and social regeneration in deprived urban and rural communities. This trend has been identified in previous surveys (for example [19], which observed that British respondents ranked similar options lower than respondents from other European countries (e.g. France). In this survey, British respondents had the least concern across a range of issues.

Differences were also observed in marine and coastal specific priorities for the Channel. English respondents placed a higher priority on ensuring cleaner water and beaches and improving coastal flood defences, when compared to French respondents. The importance of cleanliness of water and beaches, coastal erosion and flooding to UK respondents has been identified previously in PPR research [24]. The importance placed on improvements to coastal flood defences may also be as a result of the survey taking place less than 6 months after severe weather and flooding in southern England (both coastal and inland) from early February of 2014 [51]. The severe weather events resulted, for example, in the severing of the main rail link running along the south coast, west of Exeter and into Cornwall [52]. Further, experience of coastal erosion and flooding has been shown to be directly related to willingness to take personal action [53]. On the other hand, French respondents ranked priorities relating to offshore marine renewable energy, the sustainability of businesses, eco-friendly developments, research and cultural links higher than English respondents. This aligns with a

10 country EU study [19] which considered the importance of the oceans to individuals. On the basis of interviews, that study found that French respondents placed significantly more importance on uses of the ocean relating to energy, employment, culture and identity, and education and science, in comparison to UK respondents [19].

Although the study discussed in this paper explored country-level differences in uses and perceptions, it did not investigate the influence of additional socio-demographic variables (e.g. age, gender, employment level, for example). The paper aimed to investigate the overarching trends, rather than the influence of specific variables/the variation between groups. Further, there are a number of challenges associated with the data including differences in the nature and format of socio-demographic data for the two countries (e.g. education level and socio-economic status) as well as missing values (e.g. income). It is intended that a future paper will explore the data further, addressing these challenges, to examine the influence of socio-demographic variables (including age) on public use, perceptions and pro-environmental behaviours in the Channel region. Additional variables that should also be considered in future surveys include proximity to the Channel coast.

#### **5.4. Implications and future research**

This research is, to the authors' knowledge, the first study to identify the public use and perceptions of the population at the scale of the Channel region. This study has provided detailed information on public use of the Channel, and priorities for future funding within the region, from respondents in both England and France who live in areas close to the Channel.

There are a number of potential implications of this research. Firstly, the research makes a contribution to the wider PPR literature, discussed in Section 2, as the first Channel-specific PPR study to have been conducted. To date there still exists a relatively poor understanding of public perceptions towards the seas and oceans [10, 19-20]. PPR has been identified as a key area of research for improving our ability to conserve and manage the world's marine resources [10, 16] and by identifying specific activities undertaken by survey respondents, and linking those to funding preferences, it could be possible to frame marine conservation messages to different audiences (for example based on activities and country).

Secondly the study provides data on the social and behavioural characteristics of the Channel community, including the motivational and regional predictors of visits to the Channel Coast. The results of this study could have wider implications for destination tourism [54] in the Channel coastal area, as well as marine and coastal management and planning in the Channel region. This type of data may contribute to current baseline data on the social environment of marine and coastal

environments and may be useful for the development and monitoring of marine plans in England and France [35, 55-56]. For example, social data is necessary for monitoring the impact of marine plans on communities adjacent to the English Channel [55]. In addition, the data may help to shape funding programmes (e.g. future Interreg programmes) and inform regional and local strategic planning (e.g. local enterprise partnerships and local government). Lastly, the research may help to shape engagement approaches for specific audiences. A better understanding of the public uses and perceptions of the marine and coastal environment can help to identify the best ways to frame conservation messages in the Channel region and how to tailor messages for specific target groups [16]. By actively engaging the public in thinking about how and why they use the marine environment, and how their actions can positively (or negatively) impact on it, the research intended to achieve a better understanding of social values, attitudes and uses of the marine and coastal environment [8].

In considering how to achieve Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 14 to conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources, there are many lessons to be learned from coastal management and the efforts of coastal communities [18]. Lessons such as coordination and collaboration between sectoral institutions and government, stakeholder participation to ensure that public views are heard, and integration of both scientific and traditional knowledge, could benefit management of human activities in ocean ecosystems everywhere [18]. These lessons should include ways to identify how the costs and benefits of conservation and management can be shared in an equitable way so that a disproportionate burden does not fall on coastal communities, for example, in the development of Marine Protected Areas [21].

## **6. Conclusions**

To date a relatively poor understanding of public perceptions towards the seas and oceans remains. This study contributes to the debate on PPR through its examination of the public use of, and funding priorities for, the Channel's marine and coastal environment. The study presents social baseline data on public use of the Channel coasts of England and France, including reasons for visits/use, frequency of use, and the types of activities undertaken. The coasts of England and France are distinct in terms of the types of leisure and recreation activities undertaken. Public funding priorities for the Channel coasts were also elucidated. As a whole, environmental issues were generally viewed as more important than economic ones and the public prioritise plans to ensure cleaner water and beaches and protect plants and animals.

There were also country-level differences in the reasons for use of the Channel coast and the priorities for the area. For example, cleaner water and beaches, and improved coastal flood defences, were more highly prioritised by English respondents compared to French respondents, while offshore renewable energy, sustainability of businesses, eco-friendly developments, and research and cultural links were more highly prioritised by French respondents compared to English respondents. This highlights that there are distinctions between (i) the two coasts and (ii) the public in England and France. An understanding of these distinctions and the social and behavioural characteristics of the public may have a number of implications for PPR research, the marine and coastal governance of the Channel (including marine spatial planning and management), future funding in the region and the development of public engagement approaches.

Understanding the different uses of the coasts can contribute to effective governance in the wider context of the oceans. There are many lessons that can be learned from coastal management activities such as cooperation between institutions and government, and stakeholder participation activities at the local community level, for example [18]. Integration of both scientific and traditional (local) knowledge, could also benefit management of human activities in ocean ecosystems more widely, or more locally in the development of Marine Protected Areas, for example [18].

#### **Acknowledgement:**

The authors would like to thank the reviewers and editors for their comments that have helped them improve the paper. They would also like to thank Rodrigo Lozano for his suggestions in refining the paper.

**Funding Statement:** This PEGASEAS – Promoting Effective Governance of the Channel Ecosystem – Project was funded through the Interreg IV A (France (Manche) – England) Cross-Border Co-operation Programme, and was fully funded under the European Regional Development Fund. For further information see <http://www.pegaseas.eu>

## References:

- [1] Costanza, R., de Groot, R., Sutton, P., van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S.J., Kubiszewski, I., Farber, S. and Turner, R.K. (2014). Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global Environmental Change*, **26**, pp.152-158. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/gloenvcha.2014.04.002>
- [2] Crain, C.M., Halpern, B.S., Beck, M.W. and Kappel, C.V. (2009). Understanding and managing human threats to the coastal marine environment. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1162**(1), pp.39-62. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04496.x>
- [3] Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Ecosystems and Human Well-being: General Synthesis Report. World Resources Institute. Washington, DC. ISBN: 9781597260404
- [4] Merrie, A., Dunn, D.C., Metian, M., Boustany, A.M., Takei, Y., Elferink, A.O. and Österblom, H. (2014). An ocean of surprises – trends in human use, unexpected dynamics and governance challenges in areas beyond national jurisdiction. *Global Environmental Change*, 27(1), pp. 19–31. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.012>
- [5] United Nations, 2016. World Ocean Assessment I. United Nations, New York. Available at: [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/global\\_reporting/WOA\\_RPROC/WOACompilation.pdf](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/global_reporting/WOA_RPROC/WOACompilation.pdf)
- [6] Glegg, G., Jefferson, R., and Fletcher, S. (2015). Marine Governance in the English Channel (La Manche): Linking science and management. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, **95**, pp 707-718. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.02.020>
- [7] International Hydrographic Organization (1953). Limits of Oceans and Seas, Special Publication, Vol. 21, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., 42 pp. Available at: <https://epic.awi.de/29772/1/IHO1953a.pdf>
- [8] Shellock, R.E. and Carpenter, A. (2015). Public perceptions of the marine and coastal environment. *Ocean Challenge*, 21(1), pp 10-12. UK: Challenger Society for Marine Sciences
- [9] Petit, L. and Carpenter, A. (2014). Towards Better Governance of the Channel Ecosystem. Report from the Promoting Effective Governance of the Channel Ecosystem Project. The ‘PEGASEAS’ project was selected under the European Cross-border Cooperation Programme Interreg IV A France (Channel) – England, funded by the ERDF.

558 [10] Jefferson, R., McKinley, E., Capstick, S., Fletcher, S., Griffin, H. and Milanese, M. (2015).  
 559 Understanding audiences: making public perceptions research matter to marine conservation. *Ocean*  
 560 *& Coastal Management*, **115**, pp.61-70. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2015.06.014>

561 [11] Lotze, H.K., Coll, M., Magera, A.M., Ward-Paige, C. and Airoidi, L. (2011). Recovery of marine  
 562 animal populations and ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **26**, 595-605. DOI:  
 563 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.07.008>

564 [12] Walker-Springett, K., Jefferson, R., Böck, K., Breckwoldt, A., Comby, E., Cottet, M., Hübner, G., Le  
 565 Lay, Y.F., Shaw, S. and Wyles, K. (2016). Ways forward for aquatic conservation: Applications of  
 566 environmental psychology to support management objectives. *Journal of Environmental*  
 567 *Management*, **166**, pp.525-536. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envman.2015.11.002>

568 [13] Vincent, A.C.J. (2011). Saving the shallows: focusing marine conservation where people might  
 569 care. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, **21**(6), pp.495-499. DOI:  
 570 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/aqc.1226>

571 [14] McKinley, E. and Fletcher, S. (2010). Individual responsibility for the oceans? An evaluation of  
 572 marine citizenship by UK marine practitioners. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **53**(7), pp 379-384. DOI:  
 573 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.04.012>

574 [15] McKinley, E. and Fletcher, S. (2012). Improving marine environmental health through marine  
 575 citizenship: a call for debate. *Marine Policy*, **36**(3), pp.839-843. DOI:  
 576 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2011.11.001>

577 [16] Parsons, E.C.M., Favaro, B., Aguirre, A.A., Bauer, A.L., Blight, L.K., Cigliano, J.A., Coleman, M.A.,  
 578 Côté, I.M., Draheim, M., Fletcher, S. and Foley, M.M. (2014). Seventy-One Important Questions for the  
 579 Conservation of Marine Biodiversity. *Conservation Biology*, **28**(5), pp.1206-1214. DOI:  
 580 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12303>

581 [17] Vierros, M (2017). Global Marine Governance and Ocean Management for the Achievement of  
 582 SDG14. *UN Chronicle*, **LIV** (1&2), May 2017. Available at: [https://unchronicle.un.org/article/global-](https://unchronicle.un.org/article/global-marine-governance-and-oceans-management-achievement-sdg-14)  
 583 [marine-governance-and-oceans-management-achievement-sdg-14](https://unchronicle.un.org/article/global-marine-governance-and-oceans-management-achievement-sdg-14)



- 584 [18] United Nations (undated). Sustainable Development Goals. Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably  
 585 use the oceans, seas and marine resources. Available at:  
 586 <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/oceans/>
- 587 [19] Potts, T., Pita, C., O'Higgins T. and Mee, L. (2016). Who cares? European attitudes towards marine  
 588 and coastal environments, *Marine Policy*, 72, 59-66. DOI:  
 589 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.06.012>
- 590 [20] Jefferson, R.L., Bailey, L., Laffoley D. d'A., Richards, J.P. and Attrill, M.J. (2014). Public perceptions  
 591 of the UK marine environment. *Marine Policy*, 43, pp 327-337. DOI:  
 592 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.07.004>
- 593 [21] Fletcher, S., Jefferson, R., and McKinley, E. (2012). Exploring the shallows: a response to 'Saving  
 594 the shallows: focusing marine conservation where people might care'. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine  
 595 and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 22 (1), 7–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/1.1002/aqc.220>
- 596 [22] Capstick, S.B. and Pidgeon, N.F. (2014). Public perception of cold weather events as evidence for  
 597 and against climate change. *Climate Change*, 122, pp 695-708. DOI:  
 598 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-1003-1>
- 599 [23] Gelcich, S., Buckley, P., Pinnegar, J.K., Chilvers, J., Lorenzoni, I., Terry, G., Guerrero, M., Castilla,  
 600 J.C., Valdebenito, A. and Duarte, C.M. (2014). Public awareness, concerns, and priorities about  
 601 anthropogenic impacts on marine environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
 602 111(42), pp.15042-15047. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1417344111>
- 603 [24] Chilvers, J., Lorenzoni, I., Terry, G., Buckley, P., Pinnegar, J.K. and Gelcich, S. (2014). Public  
 604 engagement with marine climate change issues: (Re) framings, understandings and responses. *Global  
 605 Environmental Change*, 29, pp.165-179. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.09.006>
- 606 [25] Hawkins, J.P., O'Leary, B.C., Bassett, N., Peters, H., Rakowski, S., Reeve, G. and Roberts, C.M.  
 607 (2016). Public awareness and attitudes towards marine protection in the United Kingdom. *Marine  
 608 Pollution Bulletin*, 111(1-2), pp.231-236. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.07.003>
- 609 [26] Hattam, C., Hooper, T. and Beaumont, N. (2015). Public Perceptions of Offshore Wind Farms.  
 610 The Crown Estate, 50 pages, ISBN: 978-1-906410-66-7

- 611 [27] Voyer, M., Gladstone, W. and Goodall, H. (2012). Methods of social assessment in Marine  
612 Protected Area planning: is public participation enough? *Marine Planning*, **36**, pp 432-439. DOI:  
613 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2011.08.002>
- 614 [28] Fletcher, S., McKinley, E., Buchan, K.C., Smith, N. and McHugh, K. (2013). Effective practice in  
615 marine spatial planning: A participatory evaluation of experience in Southern England. *Marine Policy*,  
616 **39**, pp 341-348. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2012.09.003>
- 617 [29] van Hoof, L., van Leeuwen, J., and van Tatenhove, J. (2012). All at sea: regionalisation and  
618 integration of marine policy in Europe. *Maritime Studies*, **11**(9). DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/2212-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/2212-9790-11-9)  
619 [9790-11-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/2212-9790-11-9)
- 620 [30] Ahtiainen, H., Artell, J., Czajkowski, M., Hasler, B., Hasselström, L., Hyytiäinen, K., Meyerhoff, J.,  
621 Smart, J.C.R., Söderqvist, T., Zimmer, K., Khaleeva, J., Rastrigina, O., and Tuhkanen, H. (2013). Public  
622 preferences regarding use and condition of the Baltic Sea – An international comparison informing  
623 marine policy. *Marine Policy*, **42**, pp 20-30. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.01.011>
- 624 [31] Thomas, G.O., Poortinga, W. and Sautkina, E. (2016). The Welsh Single-Use Carrier Bag Charge  
625 and behavioural spillover. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, **47**, pp 126-135. DOI:  
626 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.05.008>
- 627 [32] Barr, S. and Gilg, A.W. (2007). A conceptual framework for understanding and analysing attitudes  
628 towards environmental behaviour. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, **89**(4), pp 361-  
629 379. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2007.00266>
- 630 [33] Cigliano, J.A., Meyer, R., Ballard, H.L., Freitag, A., Phillips, T.B. and Wasser, A. (2015). Making  
631 marine and coastal science matter. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, **115**, pp 77-87. DOI:  
632 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2015.06.012>
- 633 [34] McKinley, E. (2010). A critical evaluation of the concept of marine citizenship and its application  
634 to contemporary UK marine management. Pub: Bournemouth University, School of Applied Sciences,  
635 Bournemouth, UK
- 636 [35] Elliott, L.R., White, M.P., Grellier, J., Rees, S., Waters, R., & Fleming, L.E. (2018). Recreational visits  
637 to marine and coastal environments in England: Where, what, who, why, and when? *Marine Policy*. **IN**  
638 **THIS SPECIAL ISSUE – accepted for publication**

- 639 [36] Fletcher, S., Potts, J.S., Heeps, C. and Pike, K. (2009). Public awareness of marine environmental  
640 issues in the UK. *Marine Policy*, **33**(2), pp 370-375. DOI:  
641 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2008.08.004>
- 642 [37] Rodwell, L.D., Fletcher, S., Glegg, G.A., Campbell, M., Rees, S.E., Ashley, M., Linley, E.A., Frost, M.,  
643 Earll, B., Wynn, R.B., Mee, L., Almada-Viella, P., Lear, D., Stanger, P., Colenutt, A., Davenport, F., Barker  
644 Bradshaw, N.J. and Covey, R. (2014). Marine and coastal policy in the UK: Challenges and opportunities  
645 in a new era. *Marine Policy*, **45**, pp 251-258. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.09.014>
- 646 [38] Lefevre, S., Dal, M. and Mattíasdóttir, A. (2007). Online data collection in academic research:  
647 advantages and limitations. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, **38**(4), pp 574-582. DOI:  
648 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00638.x>
- 649 [39] Yun, G.W. and Trumbo, C.W. (2006). Comparative Response to a Survey Executed by Post, E-Mail,  
650 & Web Form. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, **6**(1). DOI:  
651 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2000.tb00112.x>
- 652 [40] Kaplowitz, M.D., Hadlock, T.D. and Levine, R. (2004). A Comparison of Web and Mail Survey  
653 Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, **68**(1), March 2004, pp 94-101. DOI:  
654 <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfh006>
- 655 [41] Ilieva, J., Baron, S. and Healey, N.M. (2002). Online surveys in marketing research: Pros and cons.  
656 *International Journal of Market Research*, **44**(3), pp 361-376. Retrieved from [http://0-  
657 search.proquest.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/docview/214815221?accountid=14664](http://0-search.proquest.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/docview/214815221?accountid=14664)
- 658 [42] Evans, J.R. and Mathur, A. (2005). The value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, **15**(2), pp 195-  
659 219. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10662240510590360>
- 660 [43] Knapp, H. and Kirk, S.A. (2003). Using pencil and paper, Internet and touch-tone phones for self-  
661 administered surveys: does the methodology matter? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, **19**(1), pp 117-  
662 134. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(02\)00008-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(02)00008-0)
- 663 [44] Wright, K.B. (2005). Researching Internet-Based Populations: Advantages and Disadvantages of  
664 Online Survey Research, Online Questionnaire Authoring Software Packages, and Web Survey

665 Services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, **10**(3), DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00259.x)  
666 [6101.2005.tb00259.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00259.x)

667 [45] Moore, D.S. and McCabe, G.P. (2006). Introduction to the practice of statistics, Fifth edition. W.  
668 H. Freeman and Company: New York

669 [46] European Commission (2014). Public Opinion Eurobarometer Survey. What do you think are the  
670 two most important issues facing the EU at the moment? French and UK Responses for 05/11 to  
671 06/2014. Available at:  
672 [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/cf/showtable.cfm?keyID=3805&nationID=6.15.&startdate=2011](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/cf/showtable.cfm?keyID=3805&nationID=6.15.&startdate=2011.05&enddate=2014.06)  
673 [.05&enddate=2014.06](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/cf/showtable.cfm?keyID=3805&nationID=6.15.&startdate=2011.05&enddate=2014.06)

674 [47] Howard, C. and Parsons, E.C.M. (2006). Attitudes of Scottish city inhabitants to cetacean  
675 conservation. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, **15**(14), pp.4335-4356. DOI:  
676 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-005-3740-6>

677 [48] Mee, L.D., Jefferson, R.L., Laffoley, D.D.A. and Elliott, M. (2008). How good is good? Human  
678 values and Europe's proposed Marine Strategy Directive. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, **56**(2), pp.187-  
679 204. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2007.09.038>

680 [49] Natural England (2008). Marine protected areas, qualitative value mode research. Natural  
681 England Research Information Note RIN019, First edition 3 September 2008. Available at:  
682 <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/67001>

683 [50] Rose C, Dade, P., Scott, J. (2008). Qualitative and quantitative research into public engagement  
684 with the undersea landscape in England. Natural England Research Reports, NERR019.

685 [51] BBC (2014a). Coastal communities in Devon and Cornwall flooded. Available at:  
686 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-26012890>

687 [52] BBC (2014b). UK storms destroy railway line and leave thousands without power. Available at:  
688 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-26042990>

689 [53] Harvatt, J., Petts, J. and Chilvers, J. (2011). Understanding householder responses to natural  
690 hazards: flooding and sea-level rise comparisons. *Journal of Risk Research*, **14**(1), pp.63-83. DOI:  
691 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1018/13669877.2010.503935>

692 [54] Soteriades, M. (2012). Tourism destination marketing: approaches improving effectiveness  
693 and efficiency. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, **3**(2), 107-120. DOI:  
694 <https://doi.org/10.1108/17579881211248781>

695 [55] Marine Management Organisation. (2016). Evidence requirement R103: The baseline social  
696 environment of the English marine plan areas. Available at:  
697 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-baseline-social-environment-of-the-english-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-baseline-social-environment-of-the-english-marine-plan-areas)  
698 [marine-plan-areas](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-baseline-social-environment-of-the-english-marine-plan-areas)

699 [56] Trouillet, B., Guineberteau, T., de Cacqueray, M. and Rochette, J. (2011). Planning the sea: The  
700 French experience. Contribution to marine spatial planning perspectives. *Marine Policy*, **35**(3),  
701 pp.324-334. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2010.10.012>

702

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Prior to completing the survey, respondents were provided with the following statement to define the area of the Channel.

*“This survey aims to get your views on the future management of the Channel Coast. The English Channel includes all the South Coast of England, from Kent to Cornwall. The Manche Coast includes all the North Coast of France, from Calais to Brest.”*

**Table 1: Summary of Public Survey Questions**

Theme	Question	Categories
<b>Background/socio-demographic information</b>	<b>Q1. What region do you live in?</b> <i>Respondents were asked to select 1 option only</i>	<p><i>England:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Cornwall and Isles of Scilly</li> <li>(2) Devon</li> <li>(3) Somerset</li> <li>(4) Dorset</li> <li>(5) Hampshire</li> <li>(6) Isle of Wight</li> <li>(7) West Sussex</li> <li>(8) East Sussex</li> <li>(9) Kent</li> <li>(10) Essex</li> <li>(11) Norfolk</li> <li>(12) Suffolk</li> <li>(13) Cambridgeshire</li> <li>(14) Wiltshire</li> <li>(15) Surrey</li> </ul> <p><i>France:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(16) Finistère</li> <li>(17) Côtes-d'Armor</li> <li>(18) Ile-et-Vilaine</li> <li>(19) Manche</li> <li>(20) Calvados</li> <li>(21) Eure</li> <li>(22) Seine-Maritime</li> <li>(23) Somme</li> <li>(24) Pas-de-Calais</li> <li>(25) Nord</li> </ul>
	<b>Q2. Which of the following best describes the area where you live?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Urban location</li> <li>(2) Suburban location</li> <li>(3) Village/rural location</li> <li>(4) Other</li> </ul>

<b>Public use of the Channel (English Channel and/or La Manche)</b>	<b>Q3: How often do you visit the Channel Coast?</b> <i>Respondents were asked to select 1 option only, for each side of the Channel (English Channel Coast and the French Manche Coast)</i>	(1) Every day (2) Several times a week (3) (3) Once a week (4) Once or Twice a month (5) Once every 2-3 months (6) Less than once a year (7) Never
	<b>Q4: Why do you visit the Channel coast?</b> <i>Respondents were asked to select all options that applied to them, for each side of the Channel (English Channel Coast and the French Manche Coast)</i>	(1) Holiday (2) Work (3) Recreation (4) Live there (5) Travel
	<b>Q5: What do you do when you visit the Channel Coast?</b> <i>Respondents were asked to select the five main activities that they participated in, for each side of the Channel (English Channel Coast and the French Manche Coast).</i>	(1) Boating Activities (e.g. sailing and motorboating) (2) Surface watersports (e.g. waterskiing, rowing, kayaking) (3) In-water watersports (e.g. scuba diving, snorkelling, swimming) (4) Recreational fishing (e.g. from the shore or boat) (5) Use coastal paths (e.g. for hiking, walking and running) (6) Wildlife watching (e.g. bird-watching, rockpooling) (7) Visit tourist attractions (e.g. theme parks, aquariums) (8) Visit cultural attractions (e.g. museums, art galleries) (9) Visit historic landmarks (e.g. castles, monuments and heritage sites) (10) Artistic and creative activities (e.g. photography, painting, dancing) (11) Spiritual activities (e.g. visiting places of worship, religious landmarks, retreats or workshops) (12) Enjoy the scenery (e.g. look at the sea view) (13) Education or research (e.g. school excursions to visitor centres, studying the environment) (14) Relax and unwind (15) Social activities (e.g. meeting with friends and family)
<b>Public funding priorities for the Channel</b>	<b>Q6: If there was public funding available to improve the Channel Coast, how would you spend it?</b> <i>Respondents were asked to rate each of the 13 priorities on a 5 point likert scale (not important to very important).</i>	(1) To support and develop future sustainability in businesses (2) To help businesses better respond to economic pressures and/or create new jobs (3) To strengthen and build networks between businesses and other stakeholder groups (4) To further research into renewable energy technology and its potential impacts (on land and sea) (5) To increase the use and awareness of renewable energy by businesses and the public (6) To promote tourism and interest in the history, culture and geology and other attractions on the Channel coast (7) To support local businesses providing services or goods to visitors and tourists of the Channel Coast

	<p>(8) To raise public awareness of the Channel environment (e.g. through campaigns and social media)</p> <p>(9) To reduce pollution and improve the management of environmental risks</p> <p>(10) To improve the management of natural resources and conservation of the Channel Environment</p> <p>(11) To increase awareness of the benefits that the Channel environment provides to humans (e.g. fish, leisure and recreation, health)</p> <p>(12) To support adaptation to climate change</p> <p>(13) To support physical, economic and social regeneration in deprived urban and rural communities</p>
<p><b>Q7: This question specifically focuses on the Channel's marine and coastal environment. If there was public funding available, how would you spend it?</b></p> <p><i>From the list of priorities, respondents were asked to select their:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Five most favoured priorities</i></p> <p><i>(b) Five least favoured priorities</i></p> <p><i>(Note these priorities could not overlap).</i></p>	<p>(1) Protecting plants and animals in the sea</p> <p>(2) Protecting plants and animals on the coast</p> <p>(3) Working with businesses to become more sustainable and eco-friendly</p> <p>(4) Creating new job opportunities on the coast and in the seas</p> <p>(5) Promoting marine recreation and leisure opportunities</p> <p>(6) Support the fishing industry</p> <p>(7) Encouraging eco-friendly developments around ports</p> <p>(8) Encouraging offshore marine renewable energy</p> <p>(9) Enhancing safety at sea</p> <p>(10) Promoting marine pollution prevention</p> <p>(11) Improving coastal flood defences</p> <p>(12) Identifying priorities for coastal adaptation to climate change</p> <p>(13) Ensuring clean water and beaches</p> <p>(14) Creating stronger cultural links across the Channel</p> <p>(15) Promoting cultural heritage and the arts around the Channel</p> <p>(16) Developing better transport links across the Channel</p> <p>(17) Promoting research to support the better management of the Channel</p>
<p><b>Participation in pro-environmental behaviours</b></p>	<p><b>Q8: Based on your knowledge and responses to this survey, have you or would you be willing to change your behaviour to protect the environment?</b></p> <p><i>Respondents were asked to select the statement (a-h) that best described their intentions for each of the 11 pro-environmental behaviours</i></p> <p><i>(See categories column for statements and pro-environmental behaviours)</i></p> <p><b>Pro-environmental behaviours:</b></p> <p>(1) Buy sustainably sourced fish</p> <p>(2) Join marine conservation groups and take part in activities (e.g. beach cleaning)</p> <p>(3) Switch to energy from renewable sources</p> <p>(4) Use fewer plastic bags</p> <p>(5) Buy more organic or locally produced food</p> <p>(6) Write to your local politicians about marine issues</p> <p>(7) Use more public transport</p> <p>(8) Vote for politicians who support marine issues</p> <p>(9) Participate in public meetings or coastal forums</p> <p>(10) Support campaigns for more marine protected areas</p> <p>(11) Take part in marine planning</p>



**Statements:**

- (a) I like my lifestyle the way it is and am not likely to make this change
- (b) I'd like to make this change but I don't know what to do
- (c) I'd like to make this change but it's too difficult
- (d) I'd make this change if I knew other people were doing it too
- (e) I intend to make this change
- (f) I already do a lot to protect the environment so it would be difficult to do more
- (g) I already do this
- (h) Don't know

711

712

**Table 2: Characteristics of survey respondents (n=2000)**


	England (n = 999)	France (n=1001)
<b>Age group</b>	%	%
25 and under	13.4	15.4
26 – 35	19.5	13.5
36 – 35	21.9	18.8
46 – 55	19.9	19.6
56 – 55	12.8	23.8
66 and over	12.4	9.0
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	44.5	48.5
Female	55.5	51.5
<b>Education Level</b>		
No formal qualification / diploma	7.5	2.8
GCSE/CSE/O level UK - GCSE/NVQ France	32.7	22.7
A Level/Scottish Higher UK - A Level France	24.7	28.1
Degree level qualification or equivalent	25.5	18.3
Masters Level qualification or equivalent	6.8	24.1
PhD Level qualification or equivalent	1.5	3.7
Not known	1.2	0.4
<b>Employment Status</b>		
Employee full time (30+ hours/week)	40.7	48.1
Employee part time (less than 30 hours/week)	13.4	7.9
Self-employed full time (30+ hours/week)	7.0	2.5
Self-employed part time (less than 30 hours/week)	2.4	1.2
In full time education	5.6	7.3
Retired	16.3	20.7
Not working for any other reason	14.5	12.3

717 **Table 3: Most favoured priorities for spending on the marine and coastal environment by country and age group (percentage of responses by age group)**

Preference	English Responses as percentage						French responses as percentage					
	25 and under (n=134)	26-35 (n=195)	36-45 (n=219)	46-55 (n=199)	56-65 (n=288)	66 and over (n=124)	25 and under (n=154)	26-35 (n=135)	36-45 (n=188)	46-55 (n=196)	56-65 (n=238)	66 and over (n=90)
Clean water and beaches	55.97	57.44	67.58	74.37	75.00	70.16	50.65	50.37	62.77	63.78	60.92	64.44
Protecting plants and animals in the sea	50.75	48.21	56.16	56.28	56.25	47.58	51.95	48.89	47.87	50.00	52.10	44.44
Protecting plants and animals on the coast	41.79	49.74	49.32	56.78	49.22	40.32	48.05	46.67	49.47	55.10	49.16	50.00
Improving coastal flood defences	43.28	47.69	49.77	54.27	59.38	60.48	27.92	22.96	28.19	27.04	33.19	36.67
Marine pollution prevention	38.06	36.41	37.44	38.19	53.91	46.77	35.06	34.07	40.96	40.82	45.38	43.33
Support for fishing industry	23.88	29.23	31.05	32.16	41.41	55.65	25.97	28.89	23.94	34.18	45.38	45.56
Creating new job opportunities	33.58	32.31	31.51	25.13	28.91	33.06	31.82	37.04	32.98	39.80	31.09	33.33
Offshore marine renewable energy	32.84	24.10	26.03	25.63	13.28	20.97	32.47	32.59	27.66	30.10	27.73	26.67
Enhancing safety are sea	22.39	33.85	24.20	20.60	30.47	26.61	24.03	21.48	21.81	19.90	28.15	33.33
Helping business become more sustainable/eco-friendly	32.09	23.59	14.61	14.07	13.28	12.90	21.43	27.41	28.19	25.00	23.53	20.00
Eco-friendly port development	23.88	19.49	16.44	19.60	14.06	12.10	22.73	28.89	24.47	21.94	18.91	14.44
Better transport links across the Channel	20.90	20.00	17.81	16.58	19.53	14.52	22.73	24.44	16.49	17.86	15.55	13.33
Cultural heritage and arts around the Channel	20.90	16.41	16.44	12.56	12.50	17.74	24.03	24.44	19.68	16.84	15.55	13.33
Coastal adaptation to climate change	20.90	16.41	19.18	14.72	11.72	12.90	21.43	15.56	17.55	16.84	10.50	14.44
Marine recreation and leisure opportunities	14.18	16.92	21.70	18.09	8.59	12.90	22.08	14.81	23.94	12.24	12.18	12.22
Research/support for better management of Channel	9.70	14.36	14.16	11.56	6.25	11.29	18.18	21.48	16.49	16.84	17.65	13.33
Stronger cultural links across the Channel	14.93	13.85	7.31	10.05	6.25	4.03	19.48	20.00	17.55	11.73	8.82	10.00

718 *Note: Shaded boxes are the three highest ranked priorities by country and age group.*


719 **Figure 1: Region of English respondents by County (n = 999)**



720

721

722 **Figure 2: Region of French Respondents by Département (n = 1001)**



723

724

725